Docket No.: RPS920030209US1

Reply to the Office Action of October 14, 2008

REMARKS

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 19-31 are pending in the application. Claims 19-31 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0025]-[0033] and Figures 5a-7. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 19, 20, 23-26, and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 11-013564 to Kazuo (hereinafter "Kazuo") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0044320 to Ono et al. (hereinafter "Ono"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

<u>Independent claims 19, 25 and 31</u> have been amended to more clearly define the invention therein. These claims now recite the following features which are not taught or suggested in the combination of <u>Kazuo</u> and <u>Ono</u> cited by the Examiner, separately or in combination:

"coupling a cell phone to a <u>high-speed serial data port in a computer</u>"; and
"a <u>connector</u> in the second component, the connector in the second component being <u>adapted to be directly physically inserted into the high-speed serial data port in the computer</u>". (Emphasis added)

<u>Kazuo</u> describes a wireless phone 10 connectable, via a folding section 12, to a PC 13 via a PC card slot 13a of the PC 13, where the PC card slot 13a is a PCMCIA (parallel data) card slot. However, <u>Kazuo</u> does not disclose, teach or render obvious a <u>cell phone</u> having a <u>high-speed serial data connector</u> adapted to be connected to a high-speed serial data port of a computer, nor does it disclose, teach or render obvious all of the newly recited features of independent claims 19, 25 and 31, described above.

Additionally, <u>Ono</u> describes a portable wireless apparatus, which may be a wireless terminal 200 for communication, but does not disclose, teach or render obvious that the wireless

Docket No.: RPS920030209US1

Reply to the Office Action of October 14, 2008

terminal 200 is a <u>cell phone</u> having a high-speed serial data connector adapted to be connected to a high-speed serial data port of a computer, nor does it disclose, teach or render obvious all the other newly recited features of independent claims 19, 25, and 31, described above.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, claims 19, 25 and 31 are patentably distinguishable over <u>Kazuo</u> and <u>Ono</u>. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 19, 25 and 31 is earnestly solicited.

Dependent Claims 20, 23, 24, 26, 29 and 30

Regarding dependent claims 20, 23, 24, 26, 29 and 30, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 19 or 25, they include all of the features of the respective independent claim from which they depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding amended independent claims 19 and 25, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kazuo or Ono, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims.

In addition to the newly recited features in the independent claims, as described above, the following respective dependent claims include newly recited features not taught or suggested in the cited references, separately or in combination:

Claims 20, 26 – a USB compliant high-speed serial data port in the computer

Claims 24, 30 – a signal from a high-speed serial data port which is a
telecommunications industry standard digital data packet which is convertible into a
Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) format by a mobile telephone
switching office to which the signal is connected

Therefore, for the above reasons, dependent claims 20, 23, 24, 26, 29 and 30 are patentably distinguishable over <u>Kazuo</u> and <u>Ono</u>. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 20, 23, 24, 26, 29 and 30 is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 21, 22, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kazuo</u> in view of <u>Ono</u> and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,932 to Ohnishi et al. (hereinafter "<u>Ohnishi</u>"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Docket No.: RPS920030209US1

Reply to the Office Action of October 14, 2008

Regarding dependent claims 21, 22, 27, and 28, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 19 or 25, they include all of the features of the independent claim from which they respectively depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding amended independent claims 19 and 25, there is no teaching or suggestion in <u>Kazuo</u> or <u>Ono</u>, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims.

In addition to the newly recited features in the independent claims, as described above, the following respective dependent claims include newly recited features not taught or suggested in the cited references, separately or in combination:

Claims 21, 27 – the computer high-speed serial data port is an IEEE 1304 compliant data port

Claims 22, 28 – the cell phone connector is a high-speed serial data connector Furthermore, the cited portion of <u>Ohnishi</u> does not overcome the deficiencies of <u>Kazuo</u> and Ono, nor was Ohnishi cited by the Examiner for that purpose.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, dependent claims 21, 22, 27, and 28 are patentably distinguishable over <u>Kazuo</u>, <u>Ono</u> and <u>Ohnishi</u>, separately or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of dependent claims 21, 22, 27, and 28 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Docket No.: RPS920030209US1

Reply to the Office Action of October 14, 2008

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: January 13, 2008

8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110

Austin, TX 78759

Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: /Joseph W. King/

Joseph W. King

Registration No. 35, 768